

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed July 13, 2005 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-22 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 20 and objects to Claims 3-11, 14-19, 21, and 22. Applicants amend Claims 1, 10, 12, and 20 and cancel Claims 9 and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, Applicants amend the title in response to the Examiner's objection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to Claims 3-11, 14-19, 21 and 22 as dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. To hasten issuance of allowable subject matter, Applicants amend Claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of Claim 9 and amend Claim 12 to incorporate the limitations of Claim 18. Thus, these claims are now in condition for allowance in accordance with the Examiner's indications.

Applicants also amend Claim 10 to correctly identify the claim from which it depends and to clarify a typographical error. In addition, Applicants amend Claim 20 to incorporate limitations similar to those that the Examiner indicated as allowable. The amendment to Claim 20 adds no new matter to the disclosure of the invention and is fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 20, as amended, are thus now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1, 12, and 20 and their respective dependent claims.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,756,924 to Lee et al (hereinafter "*Lee*"). As noted above, Applicants have placed all claims in condition for allowance in accordance with the Examiner's indications, thus obviating this rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Kurt M. Pankratz, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6584.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Kurt M. Pankratz
Reg. No. 46,977

Date: October 6, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

at Customer No.

05073